DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 307 EA 023 875

AUTHOR Reed, Donald B.; Hannaford, Marion E.
TITLE Practitioners as Case Researchers and Writers.
PUB DATE Oct 91
NOTE 57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Baltimore, MD, October 25-27, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Case Studies; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Qualitative Research; Research Skills; Student Projects; *Student Research
IDENTIFIERS *Washington State University

ABSTRACT

The effect of an educational administration course at Washington State University on graduate students' acquisition of research skills and knowledge base is explored in this paper. The first part discusses the need for student-conducted case studies in educational administration. The second part describes how the course provides students with research experience through their conducting case studies of practicing educational administrators. The third part describes the impact of conducting case studies on students in terms of knowledge gained in the research process and the role under study. A survey of 44 students enrolled during 1988-90 elicited 39 returns, an approximately 87 percent response rate. Findings indicate that the degree of satisfaction with the program and course correlated positively with the degree of knowledge gained. Students gained the same level of knowledge despite differences in educational aspirations, gender, and session of enrollment. Gains include knowledge that was realized after completion of the study and the development of important research skills. Limitations include time constraints and case study as a partial solution to problems in educational administrator preparation. The appendix includes a list of leadership case studies conducted from 1989-90 as well as the survey instrument. Ten figures are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Reed
M. Hannaford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED344307

PRACTITIONERS AS CASE RESEARCHERS AND WRITERS

Donald B. Reed

Washington State University

Marion E. Hannaford

University of Victoria

This paper was prepared for presentation at the 1991 UCEA (University Council for Education Administration) Convention, Baltimore, Maryland, October, 1991. Parts of this paper were drawn from a paper, entitled "An Invitation to Share Craft Knowledge," by Donald B. Reed, yet substantially revised.

EA 023 875

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRACTITIONERS AS CASE RESEARCHERS AND WRITERS

Introduction

There are two important purposes of this paper. One purpose is concerned with the way graduate students in a course, titled School Organization and Administration, have been guided through conducting original cases studies of administrators and others working in public schools and school districts. The second purpose is concerned with the impact of these studies on the students who conducted the studies. This paper is divided into five sections. Following this brief introduction, the second section is concerned with a discussion regarding the need for student-conducted case studies in educational administration courses. The third section presents the way graduate students have been guided in conducting case studies. The fourth section explores the impact of conducting the study on the students in terms of craft and research knowledge gained. The paper concludes with a fifth section which contains several observations and recommendations.

The Need for Original Case Studies

The Foundational Educational Administration Literature: The Problem

The literature which typically serves as the foundation for the preparation of public school administrators (see, for example Hanson, 1985; Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1988; Morphett, Roe, & Reller, 1982; Silver, 1983) has eight characteristics which are important to recognize. First, the literature has a high level of abstraction. The literature

contains an abundance of generalities and relatively few specifics. Consistent with the abstract character of the literature, specific professional knowledge is typically not part of the literature. Here professional knowledge means the specific actions administrators take in fulfilling the functions of management, socialization, evaluation, and communication in their work.

Second, related to the first characteristic is how the literature considers leadership. The foundational literature usually addresses the topic of leadership in general and educational leadership in particular. However, what leaders actually intend, and how they act, believe, and behave, in educational organizations is not specifically addressed. With very few exceptions, authentic examples of leaders are not presented.

Third, at least implicit in the educational administration literature is the belief that high levels of organizational maintenance and productivity as well as organizational stability and change are tightly linked with administrator competence. Conversely, the literature assumes that low morale and low productivity as well as organizational instability and resistance to change are related to administrator incompetence. Typically, the literature does address the organizational and extra-organizational factors which are related to organizational maintenance and productivity, and organizational stability and change.

Fourth, the literature in educational administration does not address the use of power by school administrators. By not directly discussing the use of power as a means of administrative control, the literature tacitly assumes that competent administrators should and can always achieve control through willful compliance.

Fifth, the personal agonies often experienced by individual administrators and privately shared among administrators regarding what decisions to make and what decisions should have been made are not part of the educational administration literature. The style and tone of the educational administration literature suggests that competent school administrators are always self-confident and make no mistakes.

Sixth, the effect of cultural differences within a school and community on the work of educational administrators is rarely, if at all, discussed in the foundational educational administration literature. By omission, it is assumed that one style of competent educational administration is appropriate in all cultural and multicultural settings.

Seventh, the literature, with few exceptions, assumes that the work of school administrators is gender-neutral. This is to say that gender as an explanatory factor in the work of school administrators is not usually considered.

And eighth, the literature designed specifically for the purpose of preparing educational administrators does not devote much space to discussing how knowledge of educational administration is generated and reported.

It can be concluded that in general the literature which is foundational to the preparation of public school administrators provides a limited, abstract, and rather rosy picture of public school administration. Additionally, a detailed description and analysis of how educational leaders act and how their actions are related to the organizational and extra-organizational context is not addressed. Furthermore, cultural and gender considerations are rarely considered. Also, the literature does not emphasize to any extent the issue of how knowledge in educational administration is generated, evaluated, reported, and disseminated.

Practitioner Produced Literature: A Solution

In response to the characteristics of the literature foundational to the preparation of educational administrators, additions need to be incorporated. These additions can be understood at a practical, substantive, and theoretical level. At a practical level, what is needed are a variety of detailed pictures of authentic and competent school administrators, both women and men at work in the context of real schools, real districts, and real communities. At a substantive level, what is needed are detailed pictures which contrast the work of administrators with administrators <u>as leaders</u>. And, at a theoretical level, what is needed is a more thorough theoretical understanding of the work of public school administrators at work in schools, districts, and communities.

A response to the characteristics of the foundational literature used in the preparation of educational administrators

and consistent with the needs presented above is to provide graduate students, who are also professional educators, preparing for entry as well as high level roles in educational administration with a set of experience through which they can generate research literature to augment the foundational literature. The student generated literature should provide a rich, frank, and balanced description and analysis of the work of public school educational administrators and show how the work of educational administrators is related to the organizational and extra-organizational context. Additionally, the experiences through which students produce literature should provide them with an authentic social science research experience, albeit limited in scope.

The Case Study Research Experience

The Purpose

One feasible avenue through which students in graduate educational administration course can produce research literature is to provide the students with a research experience through which they design, conduct, and report case studies of experienced administrators working in public schools and related organizations. Such an approach has been used since 1986 in the School Organization and Administration course offered by the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at Washington State University. Over the past five years, students enrolled in this course have been guided through a case study research experience. In the course, sometimes the case studies have been referred to as role studies, and, at other times, the

studies have been referred to as leadership studies. Regardless of what they have been called, during the ten times the course has been offered since 1986, about 100 case studies have been conducted and reported by students.

In addition to at least providing a partial solution to the literature problem discussed above, the more specific purposes of providing a case study research experience for students in the course, School Organization and Administration, are: (1) To develop a deep understanding of the actions of individuals who work in schools, particularly school administrators, and the factors in the context of their work which condition their actions, (2) to develop observational, data collection, analytic, and writing skills which are useful to school administrators, (3) to develop research skills through conducting an original research project, and (4) to develop a genuine understanding for and appreciation of social science research, particularly qualitative research. Although not central to the purpose of the research experience, it must be acknowledged that a purpose of the case study experience is to provide data and analyses which are useful to the professor teaching the course.

Parameters for Case Studies

In the graduate level course, School Organization and Administration, students are required to select the site where the case study will be conducted, the position which will be the focus of the study, and the individual who holds the position at the site selected. In order that students will be able to conduct and complete a case study effectively and efficiently,

they are given parameters for the case study. Here, the term parameters refers to set of conditions which students must meet or meet as closely as possible in initiating, conducting, and completing the case study. The parameters are of two types, theoretical and practical.

Theoretical

In organizations or units within organizations, when experienced administrators and other staff members are hired from outside the organization, there is a high probability that the organization is in a period of transformation and change and that the administrators or staff members have a mandate to make change. In organizations which are undergoing change, typically organizational factors and the work of individuals within the organization are somewhat exaggerate, hence they are easier to observe than otherwise would be the case. Therefore, students are given the theoretical parameter of selecting an individual for the focus of the case study who is experience in a role yet relatively new to a position and who has come to the position from outside the organization. Additionally, students are cautioned not to select an individual as the focus of the study who is very close to retirement.

In schools and school districts, administrative and certain staff roles vary considerably with organizational size. Organizational size of schools and school district is usually indicated by student enrollment. For example, in very small schools, the principal may also be a teacher, and in small school districts, the superintendent may also be a principal. In order

simplify the case study by focusing on an individual who holds only one position, students are given the theoretical parameter of selecting an individual for inclusion in the case study in a school or district which has a size such that the individual clearly hold only one position.

Practical

In order to increase the probability of selecting an individual for inclusion in the study who will be open and forthright as well as keeping research cost to a minimum, students are given the following practical parameters for conducting the case study. The individual selected for inclusion in the study must be unknown to the researcher, and the study must be conducted in a site which is easily accessible to the researcher. Students are also advised not to let organizational or personal reputation be a guide to site and/or individual selection.

Guidance in Conducting Case Studies

In addition to establishing parameters for the case study, students enrolled in the course are given guidance during the course concerning how to conduct a case study. Here, guidance refers to instruction regarding the theory, methods, and procedures which are necessary to conduct a case study employing a qualitative research methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lofland & Lofland, 1984; Shatzman & Strauss, 1973).

There are a variety of topics included under the general theme of guidance. These topics are not necessarily presented in

the logical order as might be found in text concerned with conducting case studies employing a qualitative research methodology. The topics are, however, presented in an order and at times when they will have practical and/or theoretical significance to students. For example, a presentation regarding the theoretical foundations of qualitative research, which is typically presented at the beginning of a research methodology text, is presented in the latter part of the school administration course after students have had considerable practical experience in using qualitative research procedures. Also, it is important to note that most topics are presented more than one time. As students gain practical experience and theoretical sophistication in conducting case studies employing qualitative research methods, topics are typically reintroduced and presented at a more detailed level.

In the order in which they are introduced, the topics which comprise the theme of guidance include: (1) The researcher as learner and not evaluator; (2) the construction of open ended, semi-structured interview guides; (3) proposals for conducting case studies, (4) gaining efficient and stable assess to the field; (5) how to listen; (6) recording and managing field data; (7) how to observe; (8) the importance of documents; (9) taking pictures; (10) analytic frameworks, (11) analyzing field data; (12) theoretical foundations of qualitative research; (13) report formats and styles; (14) writing reports of case studies, and (15) oral presentations of case studies.

It is important to emphasize that the course in which the case studies are conducted is not a research course. It is a foundational educational administration course. Hence, although the research topics included in the educational administration course may be presented in considerable detail in general and/or specialized research courses, the topics listed above are presented in the School Organization and Administration course in only enough detail and only at a level of sophistication which will allow the students to have a satisfactory and useful case study research experience.

Requirements for Conducting Case Studies

In addition to establishing parameters for conducting case studies and providing guidance in conducting case studies, specific requirements are establish for the production of case studies. The term requirements refers to specific deadlines for specific parts of a case study submitted in a specific format. The requirements are established to bring an ordering structure for conducting and reporting case studies. Additionally, the requirements are established to bring salience of the case study experience to students at particular times. Requirements are of two types, written and oral.

Written Requirements

In order to insure that each case study is completed in a systematic and timely fashion, the students are required to complete for evaluation various parts of the case study at specific times. The required parts of the case study are

intended to build on each other to achieve a satisfactory completion of the final report of the case study.

The required parts of the case study include: (1) A proposal to conduct the case study, (2) the field data (3) the first half of the final case study report, and (4) the complete case study report. Additionally, each of the parts is required to be submitted within particular style and format guidelines.

A proposal to conduct a case study is required for submission and evaluation very early in the course. Typically, the proposal for the study includes sections presenting an introduction to the study, the purpose of the study, the theoretical perspective which will guide the research, the research design and methodology including guides for semi-structured interviews, the perspectives used and procedures employed for data analysis, and the report of the study. Although the proposal is required to be written as a proposal, substantial parts of it may be used in subsequent requirements which are submitted at later dates.

During the preparation of the proposal for the case study, student experience a fair level of anxiety and uncertainty. For many, developing and writing the research proposal is their first experience with designing, conducting, and reporting a research project. Anxiety is attempted to be managed by making available example proposals written by the professor and previous students. Additionally, anxiety is attempted to be managed through the evaluation process. For the proposal requirement, the evaluation will only be considered in the evaluation of the final case study

report if the final case study report does not receive a higher evaluation than the proposal. Uncertainty do to inexperience is managed by making the example proposals available and tends to diminish with time as students gain self-confidence in conducting research.

After one-third to one-half of the course has progressed, students are required to submit their field data for review and evaluation. As noted in a previous section, prior to the initiation data collection, students are provided with considerable guidance regarding appropriate materials for recording and storing field data, and appropriate methods for recording, filing, and managing field data. Additionally, prior to data collection, students are shown authentic examples of field data. The importance of the appropriate type and size of paper is stressed as well as are the appropriate writing materials and page bindings. The proper identification and logging of field documents is also discussed.

When the field data requirement is due, students present a display of their data on a table during part of a class session. Students are encouraged to examine how others have filed, bound, and generally organized their data for analysis. During the time data are displayed, the professor examines and evaluates each student's field data. Also, students are provided a form which guides them through a self-evaluation of their own field data and on which they evaluate their data.

About two-thirds of the way through the course, students are required to submit a draft of what will be about the first half

of their final case study report. Typically, the draft includes a section introducing the case study, a section presenting the purpose of the study, a section explaining the research design and methodology, a section describing the community, district, school where the case study was conducted, a section describing the role of the individual and the individual who was the focus of the study, and a section summarizing the analytic framework used to analyze the field data. As noted previously, substantial portions and/or revised portions of the proposal can be used in the first-half report requirement.

The first-half of the final report requirement is evaluated in terms of traditional research publication criteria taking into account the level of research experience and sophistication of the individual researcher. The drafts are returned with comments regarding suggestions for improvement. Following the evaluation of the draft, the professor is available for consultation. As with the proposal to conduct the study, the evaluation of a draft is only considered in the overall evaluation of the final report if the final report is given a lower evaluation that the first-half draft.

During the last several days of the course is the deadline for the final report requirement. In addition to the sections typically contained in the first-half report requirement, the final report of the case study usually contains a section on analyzing the field data in terms of the purposes of the case study and employing the analytic framework presented in a previous section, a section which summarized the conclusions of

the study reached in the analysis section, and a section containing implications of the study for professional practice and further research. The final report usually contains a reference section and may contain various relevant appendices.

In preparing the final report, students may use sections from previous requirements in original or rewritten form. Evaluation of the final report requirement are made in terms of traditional research report criteria.

Oral Requirements

During the case study research experience, the opportunity for students to talk about the experience helps to reduce anxiety and uncertainty during the experience, build confidence, and clarify understanding of both the research process and what is being learned about the role and/or leader. During specific class sessions of the course, students are required to make oral presentations regarding what they are learning about the role or leader they are investigating. Additionally, they are required to give oral presentations regarding their experiences in data collection.

During the case study research experience, the professor establishes extended periods of times during which students may meet with him and present summaries and analyses of their field. Although not a specific requirement, students are encouraged to make an appointment and meet with the professor to give interim oral summaries of their case studies.

In addition to meeting with the course professor to give summaries and analyses of their case study field data, students

are also encouraged, yet not required, to present to each other summaries and analyses of their field data. In cases where student work in pairs on a case study, discussion of data and analyses of data take place as a matter of course.

Typically, during the final week of the course, students are required to prepare and present a formal presentation of their case study. In these presentations, students are strongly encouraged to focus the presentation on the substantive conclusions of the case study rather than on the research methods.

Following a section of the course and/or following several sections of the course, the professor typically selects four or five of the cases studies which are particularly insightful, well written, and collectively reinforce one another for inclusion in a symposium proposal for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association and/or the Annual Research Conference of the Washington Educational Research Association. Students who have participated in presentations report a challenging yet exceedingly worthwhile experience.

The Impact of the Case Study Research Experience: A Study

Purpose of the Study

In order to assess the impact of the case study experience on student researchers, who are also professional educators, a limited study was conducted. There were three purposes of the study. The first was to assess the impact of the case study experience in terms of knowledge gained from the focus of the study. The second purpose was to assess the impact of the case

study experience in terms of knowledge gained from the research process. And, the third purpose was to investigate the relationships of the impact of the case study experience and the context of the case study research experience. The overall purpose of the study was to assess the impact of the case study experience on the graduate students enrolled in the course School Organization and Administration and relate the impact with factors in the context of the researchers' experiences.

Research Design and Methodology

Design

To achieve the purposes of the study, it was decided to assess the impact of the case study research experience on the students who had conducted and completed case studies in the course, School Organization and Administration, by questioning the students regarding the impact of the experience as well as regarding their personal context during the research experience.

Character

A decision was made to conceptualize and formulate the study as a descriptive study yet guided by a theoretical framework concerned with the individual context of the case study research experience and the personal impact of the case study experience.

Scope and Limitations

As noted previously, about 100 case studies have been produced in the course over a period of about 5 years by about 100 students. However, since the initiation of the case study experience in 1986, the parameters, guidance topics, and requirements have somewhat changed. In order to reduce the

contextual variability due to changes in parameters, guidance, and requirements, it was decided to limit the study to include only those students in the study sample who had been involved in the case study experience beginning with the 1988-1989 academic year and ending with the 1989-1990 academic year.

During the 1988-1989 academic year the course was offered twice and involved 9 and 12 respectively. During the 1989-1990 academic year, the course was also offered twice and involved 9 and 14 students respectively. Hence, the number of students selected for inclusion in the study sample was 44, roughly half the number of students who had been involved in the case study experience since 1986.

It should be noted that during the time period covered by the study sample, students were allowed to work in pairs on the case study research experience. Of the 44 students included in the study sample, 6 selected to work in pairs. Hence, during the time period covered by the study, 38 students conducted individual case studies and 6 worked in pairs producing in all 41 case studies. The authors and titles of the 41 case studies are included in Appendix A.

Methodology

In order to assess descriptively the impact of the cases study research experience on individual students as well as assess their personal contexts during the case study research experience through efficient questioning of individual students, it was decided that a survey research methodology would be employed. The survey would be primarily in the form of a close-

ended, self-response survey instrument yet would contain a limited number of open-ended questions. In the following section, theoretical details of the survey instrument are discussed, and the practical aspects of the administration of the survey instrument are presented.

The Survey Instrument

In order to realize the purposes of the study, a survey instrument was developed designed for self-response by each graduate students in the study sample. Consistent with the purposes of the study, there were three purposes of the survey instrument. The first was to asses the impact on the graduate student researcher of the knowledge gained from the focus of the case study. The second purpose was to assess the impact of the knowledge gained from the research process. And, the third purpose was to explore the relationship of the impact of the case study research experience on the graduate student researcher and the factors in the context of the research experience.

Theoretical Framework

Consistent with the purposes of the study and survey instrument, a two-part theoretical framework was developed to guide instrument development. One part of the theoretical framework is concerned with (I) the graduate student context of the case study research experience. And, the other part is concerned with (II) the impact of the case study research experience on the graduate student.

The (I) context of the study is considered in terms of (A) contextual factors and (B) experiential time when the case study

was conducted. The (A) contextual factors are further considered in terms of (1) programmatic factors, (2) course factors, and (3) individual factors. And, (B) experiential time is further considered in terms of (1) past, (2) present, and (3) future.

The (II) impact of the study is considered in terms of (A) level of knowledge gained by the graduate student and (B) type of knowledge gained in the case study. The (A) level of knowledge gained is further considered in terms of (1) theoretical knowledge, (2) substantive knowledge, and (3) practical knowledge. And, the (B) the type of knowledge gained is further considered in terms of (1) the role investigated in the case study and the (2) research processes employed in conducting the case study.

A representation of the theoretical framework is presented in Figure 1.

The Questionnaire

Employing the theoretical framework as a guide, a self-response survey instrument, titled the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire, was developed. The Questionnaire contains forty-seven required response items and four optional response items. Of the forty seven items, thirty are concerned with assessing the individual student context of the case study experience, and seventeen are concerned with assessing the impact of the case study research experience on the individual student. The four optional response items are open-ended questions which allow respondents to elaborate in detail on aspects of the case study research experience not covered in the required response items.

Figure 1

A Representation of the Theoretical Framework which Guided Survey Instrument Development

CONTEXT OF THE CASE STUDY RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

	Contextual Factors		
Experiential Time When the Study Was Conducted	**Programmatic**	**Course**	**Individual**
Past	(Not assessed.)	(Not assessed.)	
Present			
Future	(Not assessed.)	(Not assessed.)	

IMPACT OF THE CASE STUDY RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

	Level of Knowledge Gained		
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Theoretical**	**Substantive**	**Practical**
Role Investigated			
Research Processes			

Appendix B contains a copy of the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire. And, Appendix C contains an item-by-factor matrix for the Questionnaire.

Questionnaire Administration

Questionnaires Set Out

Consistent with the design of the study, forty-four Questionnaires were sent to students. Contained in the Questionnaire was a set of directions. Upon completion of the Questionnaire, respondents were directed to return it in an enclosed self-address, pre-stamped envelope.

Of the 44 students to whom Questionnaires were mailed, 2 (4.5%) could be classified as non-educators, and 42 (95.5%) could be classified as educators. Of the non-educators, one was a hospital administrator, and the other was a university assistant track coach. Of the 42 who could be classified as educators, 2 (4.8%) were education college professors, 6 (14.3%) were private school personnel, and 34 (80.1%) were public school personnel. Excluding the college professors and including both private and public school educators, none of the educators held the position of superintendent, 2 (5.0%) held the position of assistant superintendent, 1 (2.5%) held the position of business manager, 7 (17.5%) held the position of program administrator, 5 (12.5%) held the position of principal, 2 (5.0%) held the position of vice principal, 1 (2,5%) held the position of communications disorders specialist, 1 (2.5%) held the position of school psychologist, 1 (2.5%) held the position of curriculum and

instruction specialist, and 20 (50.0%) held the position of teacher.

Forty (90.9%) of the 42 students held positions and resided in the State of Washington, and the remaining 4 (9.1%), 1 (2.3%) held a position and lived in the State of Idaho, and the other 3 (6.8%) resided in Asian countries and held positions in American international schools. Twenty-five (56.9%) of the students were men, and 19 (43.2%) were women.

Questionnaires Received

The analysis is based on the return of 39 (88.6%) useable Questionnaires. The five questionnaires not received were from students identified as educators. Of the five, three were teachers, one was a vice principal, and one was a school specialist.

Analyses of Data

The following is a limited and simplified analysis of the Questionnaire data. The analysis is based on the return of 39 (88.6%) useable Questionnaires. In the analysis, only descriptive statistics are used to analyze the data. In the responses employing a five point ordinal scale, it is assumed that individual responses as well as means of responses have an uncertainty in measurement of $\pm$ 0.1. Hence, difference among means must be greater than 0.1 to be considered meaningful.

It is important to note that one of the investigators was the professor who taught the course in which the case study research experience was assigned. Biased responses could have resulted, since this professor could be understood by the

students to have had some influence over their professional careers. However, because all responses were returned anonymously, it is anticipated that any bias will be minimal. It is also important to note that in constructing the questionnaire, an insufficient number of items were included in several theoretical categories. Since the cell means in these categories cannot be reported, only aggregate means are used in the analysis. Hence, considering the limitations of and simplifications in the analysis, the conclusions based on the analysis must be viewed as suggestive rather than conclusive.

The Context of the Case Study Research Experience

In presenting the analysis of the context of the case study research experience, individual factors will be examined first, followed by course factors, and concluded by programmatic factors.

Individual

In the Questionnaire, eighteen items were employed to assess the aspects of the individual context of the case study research experience. Of the eighteen items, only nine are used in the analysis. Three items are used to asses the past contextual experiences of students, four items are employed to assess present contextual experience of students, and two items are used to assess future contextual experience of students.

Past. The past experiences of individuals are considered to be related to the way they experience present and future activities. In the Questionnaire, past experiences are assessed in two areas.

These include past professional experience in public education and past academic experience.

Considering past professional experience of the respondents, the number of years of experience in public education ranged from 3 to 27 with an average of about 14 years. And, for the respondents, the number of years of experience in their current positions ranged from 1 to 23 years with an average of about 5 years.

Considering past academic experience, for about 20.5% (8) of the respondents their highest academic achievement was at the bachelors level; and for about 79.5% (31), their highest academic achievement was at the masters level.

Present. The present circumstances of individuals are also considered to be related to the way they experience new and different activities. In the Questionnaire, the present circumstances of the respondents were assessed in term of their gender and the characteristics of their current positions.

With respect to gender, 59.0% (23) of the respondents were men, and 41.0% (16) were women.

With respect to current positions of the 39 respondents, 35 (89.7%) held positions in public school districts or private school organizations, and 4 (10.2%) did not hold position in public school districts or private school organizations. Of those associate with public or private schools, 17 (48.6%) held the position of teacher, 2 (5.7%) held the position of school specialist, 1 held the position of vice principal, 5 the position of principal, 7 the position of central program coordinator or

director, 1 (2.8%) held the position of school business manager, and 2 (5.7%) held the position of assistant superintendent.

With respect to the respondents who held positions in public school districts or private school organizations, these school districts and organizations ranged in size from one with a student enrollment of about 150 to one with about 150,000 students. The median student enrollment across all districts and organizations was about 2,170.

Fourteen of the 39 respondents reported holding positions in schools. With respect to student enrollment, these schools ranged in size from a low of 57 students to a high of 1,600 students with an median of about 600 students.

Future. The expectations individuals hold for themselves at future times are considered to be related to the way they experience new and novel activities. In the Questionnaire future expectation of respondents were assessed in terms of graduate degrees and/or advanced educational certification anticipated. Of the 39 respondents, 14 (35.9%) were working on advanced graduate degrees and advanced educational certification. Of the same 39 respondents, 14 (35.9%) were working on advanced graduate degrees only, and 11 (31.4%) were working on advanced educational certification only.

It can be concluded that collectively the respondents were well educated and professionally experienced. Additionally, the group of respondents was fairly balanced in terms of the numbers of men and women, the types of positions held, and the sizes of districts and schools in which they held positions. Furthermore,

the respondents collectively were academically and professionally motivated.

Course

In the Questionnaire, eight items were used to assess the course context of students. Collectively these items assess the satisfaction of individual students with their respective experiences' in the course, School Organization and Administration. For all 39 respondents across the eight items, the mean is 4.2. The mean response indicates that students experienced positive satisfaction with the course.

Program

In the Questionnaire, three items were used to assess the program context of students. Collectively these items assess the individual satisfaction of students with their respective programs in educational administration. For all 39 respondents across the three items, the mean is 4.0. The mean response indicates the students experience positive satisfaction with their programs in educational administration.

Impact of the Case Study Research Experience

The impact of the case study research experience on students was analyzed in terms of the knowledge gained about the role which was the focus of the study and the knowledge gained about research through the research process. The overall impact of the experience was also assessed. The means of the responses by item, across items within cells, and across cells are summarized in a matrix presented in Figure 2. It is important to note that although cell means are displayed in Figure 2, they cannot be

Figure 2

Response-Mean Matrix, Regardless of Contextual Factors, for Impact-of-the-Case-Study-Research-Experience Row and Column Means for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire*

IMPACT OF THE CASE STUDY RESEARCH EXPERIENCE N = 39 [46] = 4.231 [47] = 3.947 Independent Mean 4.1 (.70)*

	Level of Knowledge Gained			
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Theoretical**	**Substantive**	**Practical**	**Row Means**
Role Investigated	[31] = 4.077 [32] = 4.154 **4.116**	[33] = 3.769 [34] = 3.718 [35] = 4.128 [36] = 3.872 **3.872**	[37] = 3.462 **3.462**	**3.9 (.56)**
Research Processes	[38] = 4.205 [39] = 4.282 **4.244**	[40] = 4.205 **4.205**	[41] = 4.205 [42] = 4.077 [43] = 4.128 [44] = 4.103 [45] = 4.000 **4.103**	**4.2 (.55)**
Column Means	**4.2 (.50)**	**3.9 (.60)**	**4.0 (.59)**	**Grand Mean** **4.0 (.49)**

*The numbers in brackets refer to items on the Questionnaire. The non-bold numbers not in brackets in the cells are the means for item responses. The numbers in parentheses are standard deviations. And, the bold numbers not in parentheses are means across item responses.

compared because of insufficient items within certain cells. It is also important to note that although the column means are calculated and presented in Figure 2, they are not considered in the following analysis. Figure 3 presents only the row and grand means which are considered with respect to various contextual factors in the remainder of the analysis.

Type of Knowledge Gained in the Case Study Research Experience Regardless of Contextual Factors. The impact of the case study research experience was analyzed in terms of the type of knowledge gained, knowledge about the role investigated and knowledge about research processes. Seven items were employed to assess the level of knowledge gained regarding the role investigated, and eight items were used to assess the level of knowledge gained concerning research processes. Across all 39 respondents, the mean for knowledge gained about the role investigated was 3.9, and the mean for knowledge gained about research processes was 4.2. The grand mean was 4.0. Employing the "0.1" decision rule noted above concerning meaningful differences, it can be concluded that students in the case study research experience, regardless of contextual factors, gained more knowledge of research processes than they did regarding knowledge of the role investigated.

Program Factor--Satisfaction with Program. To examine the association of the program contextual factor of individual satisfaction with the educational administration program and type of knowledge gained, respondents were divided into two groups. Using the mean satisfaction level of 4.0 across all 39 respondents, those scoring below the mean were placed in one group designated as

Figure 3

Response-Mean Matrix for Impact-of-Case-Study-Research-Experience, Type of Knowledge Gained (Row Means) and Overall Impact (Grand Mean), Regardless of Contextual Factors, for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire

	Means Regardless of Contextual Factors N = 39
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Row Means**
Role Investigated	3.9 (.56)*
Research Processes	4.2 (.55)
Overall Impact	**Grand Mean**
Mean of Row Means	4.0 (.49)

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

less satisfied, and those scoring above the mean were placed in a second group designed as more satisfied. Thirteen respondents were in the less satisfied group, and 26 respondents were in the more satisfied group. Figure 4 presents the means for the knowledge gained of the role investigated and of research processes, as well as grand means.

For the less satisfied group, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.7, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.0. and the grand mean is 3.9. For the more satisfied group, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 4.0, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.2, and the grand mean is 4.1. Applying the "0.1" decision rule, it can be concluded that students who were more satisfied with their programs in educational administration gained more knowledge of both the role investigated and of research processes than students who were less satisfied with their programs. Additionally, both more and less satisfied students gained more knowledge of research process than they did of the role investigated.

Course Factor--Satisfaction with Course. To examine the association of the program factor of individual satisfaction with the course, School Organization and Administration, and type of knowledge gained, respondents were divided into two groups. Using the mean satisfaction level of 4.2 across all 39 respondents, those scoring below the mean were placed in one group designated as less satisfied, and those scoring above the mean were placed in a second group designed as more satisfied.

Figure 4

Response-Mean Matrix for the Program Factor (Satisfaction with Program) and Impact-of-Case-Study-Research-Experience, Type of Knowledge Gained (Row Means) and Overall Impact (Grand Mean), for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire

	Program Factor--Satisfaction with Program N = 39	
	Less N = 13	More N = 26
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Row Means**	
Role Investigated	3.7 (.67)*	4.0 (.49)
Research Processes	4.0 (.50)	4.2 (.57)
Overall Impact	**Grand Mean**	
Mean of Row Means	3.9 (.49)	4.1 (.48)

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

Eighteen respondents were in the less satisfied group, and 21 respondents were in the more satisfied group. Figure 5 presents the means for the knowledge gained of the role investigated and of research processes, as well as grand means.

For the less satisfied group, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.6, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 3.8, and the grand mean is 3.7. For the more satisfied group, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 4.2, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.2, and the grand mean is 4.4. Employing the "0.1" decision rule, it can be concluded that students who were more satisfied with the course gained more knowledge of both the role investigated and research processes than students who were less satisfied with the course. Additionally, both more and less satisfied students gained more knowledge of research process than they did of the role investigated.

Individual Factors. The associations between five individual contextual factors and type of knowledge gained were analyzed. The individual factors include (1) degree and/or professional certification goals, (2) professional position, (3) gender, (4) term during which the study was conducted, and (5) oral presentation of the study. In the following five sections, type of knowledge gained will be analyzed in term of each of the five individual factors.

Degree and/or Professional Certification Goals. To examine the association of the individual factor of degree and/or

Figure 5

Response-Mean Matrix for the Course Factor (Satisfaction with Course) and Impact-of-Case-Study-Research-Experience, Type of Knowledge Gained (Row Means) and Overall Impact (Grand Mean), for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire

	Course Factor--Satisfaction with Course N = 39	
	Less N = 18	More N = 21
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Row Means**	
Role Investigated	3.6 (.50)*	4.2 (.46)
Research Processes	3.8 (.56)	4.4 (.40)
Overall Impact	**Grand Mean**	
Mean of Row Means	3.7 (.42)	4.3 (.38)

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

professional certification goals and type of knowledge gained, respondents were divided into three groups. In one group were 14 respondents seeking both advanced degrees and advanced professional certification. In another group were 14 respondents seeking advanced degrees only. And, in the final group were 11 respondents seeking only advanced professional certification. Figure 6 presents the means for the knowledge gained of the role investigated and of research processes, as well as grand means for all three groups.

For the group seeking both advanced degrees and advanced professional certification, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.8, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.1, and the grand mean is 4.0. For the group seeking advanced degrees only, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 4.0, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.1, and the grand mean is 4.1. For the group seeking advanced professional certification only, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.9, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.2, and the grand mean is 4.1. Applying the "0.1" decision rule, it can be concluded that those students seeking both advance academic degrees and advance professional certification gained less knowledge of the role investigated that the other groups of students. Additionally, it can be concluded that those students seeking both advanced degrees and advanced professional certification and those students seeking only advanced certification gained more knowledge of research

Figure 6

Response-Mean Matrix for the Individual Factor (Degree and/or Professional Certification Goals) and Impact-of-Case-Study-Research-Experience, Type of Knowledge Gained (Row Means) and Overall Impact (Grand Mean), for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire

	Individual Factor--Degree and/or Professional Certification Goals N = 39		
	Degree and Certification N = 14	Degree Only N = 14	Certification Only N = 11
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Row Means**		
Role Investigated	3.8 (.65)*	4.0 (.52)	3.9 (.50)
Research Processes	4.1 (.66)	4.1 (.52)	4.2 (.46)
Overall Impact	**Grand Mean**		
Mean of Row Means	4.0 (.57)	4.1 (.47)	4.1 (.45)

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

processes than they did of the role investigated. Finally, it can be concluded that the overall impact of the case study research experience was not different for the there groups of students.

Professional Position. To examine the association of the individual factor of professional position held at the time of the case study research experience and type of knowledge gained, the 35 respondents who held positions in schools and school districts or organizations were divided into two groups. In one group were 13 teachers, and in another group were 22 educational administrators. Figure 7 presents the means for the knowledge gained of the role investigated and of research processes, as well as grand means for both groups.

For the group of respondents who were teachers, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.6, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.0, and the grand mean is 3.8. For the group of respondents who were educational administrators, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 4.0, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.2, and the grand mean is 4.1. Employing the "0.1" rule, it can be concluded that students who held positions in educational administration gained more knowledge through the case study experience than did those students who held teaching positions. However, both groups of students gained more knowledge of research processes than of the role investigated.

Figure 7

Response-Mean Matrix for the Individual Factor (Position) and Impact-of-Case-Study-Research-Experience, Type of Knowledge Gained (Row Means) and Overall Impact (Grand Mean), for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire

	Individual Factor--Position N = 39	
	Teacher N = 13	Administrator N = 22
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Row Means**	
Role Investigated	3.6 (.49)*	4.0 (.53)
Research Processes	4.0 (.40)	4.2 (.61)
Overall Impact	**Grand Mean**	
Mean of Row Means	3.8 (.34)	4.1 (.53)

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

Gender. To examine the association of the individual factor of gender and type of knowledge gained, the respondents were divided into groups of 23 males and 16 females. Figure 8 presents the means for the knowledge gained of the role investigated and of research processes, as well as grand means for both groups.

For the male respondents, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.9, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.1, and the grand mean is 4.0. For the female respondents, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.9, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.2, and the grand mean is 4.0. Applying the "0.1" decision rule, it can be concluded than a students gender is not associated with knowledge gained in the case study research experience.

Enrollment Term. The course offered during the summer covers a considerably shorter time period than the course offered during the academic year. To examine the association of the individual factor of enrollment term, i.e. the type of term when the course was taken, and type of knowledge gained, the respondents were divided into two groups. One group consists of the 20 respondents who were enrolled in the course during a summer term, and the other group consists of the 19 respondents who were enrolled in the course during an academic year term. Figure 9 presents the means for the knowledge gained of the role investigated and of research processes, as well as grand means for both groups. For the group of respondents who were enrolled during a summer session, the mean for the knowledge gained of the

Figure 8

Response-Mean Matrix for the Individual Factor (Gender) and Impact-of-Case-Study-Research-Experience, Type of Knowledge Gained (Row Means) and Overall Impact (Grand Mean), for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire

	Individual Factor--Gender N = 39	
	Male N = 23	Female N = 16
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Row Means**	
Role Investigated	3.9 (.60)*	3.9 (.52)
Research Processes	4.1 (.48)	4.2 (.65)
Overall Impact	**Grand Mean**	
Mean of Row Means	4.0 (.46)	4.0 (.55)

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

Figure 9

Response-Mean Matrix for the Individual Factor (Enrollment Term) and Impact-of-Case-Study-Research-Experience, Type of Knowledge Gained (Row Means) and Overall Impact (Grand Mean), for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire

	Individual Factor--Enrollment Term N = 39	
	Summer Session N = 20	Academic Year N = 19
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Row Means**	
Role Investigated	3.8 (.53)*	3.9 (.60)
Research Processes	4.1 (.66)	4.2 (.41)
Overall Impact	**Grand Mean**	
Mean of Row Means	4.0 (.56)	4.1 (.42)

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

role investigated is 3.8, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.1, and the grand mean is 4.0. For the group of respondents who were enrolled during the academic year, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.9, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.2, and the grand mean is 4.1. Employing the "0.1" rule, it can be concluded that enrollment term and type of knowledge gained in the case study research experience are not associated. However, students, regardless of enrollment term, gained more knowledge of research processes than knowledge of the role investigated.

Oral Presentation of Study. At different times when the course has been offered, students may have been required to make a formal presentation of their case study research project, may have been able to volunteer to make a formal presentation, or may have not been required or allowed to volunteer to make a formal presentation of their case study research project. To examine the association between an oral presentation of the case study research project and type of knowledge gained, the respondents were divided into two groups. In one group of 22 are those respondents who made a formal presentation of their case study research project. In the other group of 17 are those respondents who did not make a formal presentation of their case study research project. Figure 10 presents the means for the knowledge gained of the role investigated and of research processes, as well as grand means for both groups.

For the group of respondents who presented their case

Figure 10

Response-Mean Matrix for the Individual Factor (Oral Presentation of Study) and Impact-of-Case-Study-Research-Experience, Type of Knowledge Gained (Row Means) and Overall Impact (Grand Mean), for Items on the Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire

	Individual Factor--Oral Presentation of Study N = 39	
	Presented Study N = 22	Did Not Present Study N = 17
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Row Means**	
Role Investigated	3.9 (.51)*	3.8 (.63)
Research Processes	4.2 (.42)	4.1 (.69)
Overall Impact	**Grand Mean**	
Mean of Row Means	4.1 (.41)	4.0 (.58)

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

studies, the mean for the knowledge gained and the role investigated is 3.9, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.2, and the grand mean is 4.1. For the group of respondents who did not present their case studies, the mean for the knowledge gained of the role investigated is 3.8, the mean for the knowledge gained of research processes is 4.1, and the grand mean is 4.0. Employing the "0.1" rule, it can be concluded that a formal presentation of the case study research project and knowledge gained in the case study research experience are not associated. However, all students, regardless of whether they made a formal presentation or not, gained more knowledge of research process than knowledge of the role investigated.

Conclusions

The graduate students who were enrolled in the School Organization and Administration course, who collectively were well educated and professionally experienced and who were academically and professionally motivated, found the case study research experience useful in their professional and academic preparation. Both the experiential components of the case study research experience had a substantial impact. However, the research component clearly had a greater impact on students than did the component concerned with the role investigated.

As might be expected, students who experienced their individual advanced degree and/or advanced certification programs as more satisfying, gained more knowledge from the case study research experience than those students who experienced their

programs as less satisfying. Similarly, students who experience the course as more satisfying, gained more knowledge from the case study research experience than those students who experienced the course as less satisfying.

Regardless of personal advanced degree and/or advanced certification goals, students gained the same level of knowledge from the case study research experience. However, students who held the position of educational administrator at the time the study was conducted, gained more knowledge from the experience than those students who held the position of teacher.

Both men and women students gained the same level of knowledge from the research experience. Students who were enrolled in the course during summer sessions and students who were enrolled in the course during academic-year terms gained the same level of knowledge from the research experience. And, students who made a formal presentation of their case study research project and students who did not make a formal presentation both gained the same level of knowledge from the research experience.

Observations and Recommendations Regarding Students as Case Researchers and Writers

Based on the conclusions of the study reported above and the personal experiences of the course professor, several observations and recommendations are offered regarding providing students in preparation programs for school administration with case study research experiences.

The case study research experience is a partial solution to problems previously discussed with the educational administration foundational literature. Students do get an authentic understanding of a real administrative or related role in the context of a real school in a real district. However, the important constraint of student time limits the depth and breath of the understanding gained in the case study research experience. Well conceptualized, conducted, and reported research requires the luxury of large quantities of unstructured time. To some extent, class discussions and more formal presentations tend to broaden and deepen understanding, yet they cannot make up for the time constraints students face.

Case study research is <u>research</u>. And, as research, most knowledge is generated and realized <u>after</u> the case study has been completed in its final written form. Students report that it is after the course and case study have been completed that most understanding of the role and appreciation for the research enterprise is gained.

Most student develop important research skills in conducting case studies. Students find these an unanticipated benefit. The skills of questioning, listening, observing, recording, analyzing, and writing are skills which have direct applicability to educational administration.

The satisfaction most students experience in conducting and reporting a case study needs to be reemphasized. It is the type of satisfaction one receives after hard work resulting in a very presentable product. Genuine student satisfaction from the case

study research experience, as in any teaching, leads to considerable teacher satisfaction.

References

Glaser, Barney & Strauss, Anselm L. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.

Lofland, John & Lofland Lyn H. (1984). Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis, (2nd Edition). Belemont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Hanson, E. Mark. (1985). Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior, (2nd Edition). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Hoy, Wayne K. & Miskel, Cecil G. (1987). Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice, (3rd Edition). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Kimbrough, Ralph, B., & Nunnery, Michael, Y. (1988). Educational Administration: An Introduction. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Morphett, Edgar L., Roe, John L., & Reller, Theodore L. (1982). Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues, (4th Edition). Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Shatzman Leonard & Strauss, Anselm L. (1973). Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Strauss, Anselm, & Corbin, Juliet. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Silver, Paula, F. (1983). Educational Administration: Theoretical Perspectives on Practice and Research. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Appendices

Appendix A

Leadership/Studies Case Studies

The following are the case studies of the students included in the study sample. The studies are grouped by the semester the study was conducted and reported. Each study should be regarded as an unpublished paper of the Department of Educational Administration & Supervision, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 11964-2136.

Spring 1989

Fromm, Robert E. (1989). The Role of the Secondary Athletic Direction: A Field Study.

Kelly, Daniel J. (1989). The School District Business Manager. A Field Study.

Li, Li. (1989). High School Coaches: A Qualitative Study.

McCurdy, Gail S. (1989). Analysis of the Position of Personnel Assistant.

Remaley, Anne L. (1989). The Role of Curriculum Coordinator: A Leadership Dilemma.

Reidenbach, Duane K. (1989). The Role of the Secondary School Athletic Director/Activities Director: A Field Study.

Rowse, Lynn. (1989). The School Psychologist: A Study of the Role in an Urban District.

Scheele, Majean. (1989). The Unofficial Second Commander: A Field Study of the Role of the School District's Secretary to the Superintendent.

Weinmann, Terry L. (1989). The Role of the Elementary Building Custodian. A Field Study.

Summer 1989

Cox, Donald L. (1989). Superintendent Leadership: The Control of Principals.

DeGabrile, Sandra C. & Rawls, David L. (1989). The Interim Superintendent as a Change Agent.

Hammond, Coral V. (1989). Leadership in the Role of the Assistant Superintendent.

Jamison, David L. (1989). Leadership in Public Schools: A Field Study.

Kelly Raymond S. (1989). Maintaining and Implementing a Personal Projection While Implementing and Maintaining a District Projection.

Mesa-Johnson, Delcine & Cox, John. (1989). The Modernization of a Rural School: A Leadership Study.

Phillips Robert J. & Weakely, Karen L. (1989). Effective Visionary Leadership in a Decentralized School District: A Single-Subject Case Study.

Radich Paula A. (1989). A View of Leadership Through Jason Bradley's Actions and Projections at Windsor Junior High School.

Wadlington William J. (1989). Leadership Actions and Projections: A Leadership Research Project.

Fall 1989

Busch, Phyllis N. (1989). Leadership Study of a Principal in a Target School.

Chambers, James M. (1989). A Study of Leadership Style in the Role of Superintendent of School: A Single Subject Case Study.

Dale, Elizabeth. (1989). The Leadership Style of Principal Lydia Collins, Jackson Elementary School.

David, Donald D. (1989). Leadership: A Look at an Elementary School Principal.

Jordan, Maria P. (1989). A Leadership Study of a Curriculum Coordinator at the Eastmont School District.

Nelson, Brian J. (1989). A Leadership Study: A Study of a Secondary Principal's Leadership.

Nelson, Bryan H. (1989). An Experienced Principal in a New District: A Research Study.

Scovil, Mildred. (1989). Organizational Change: A Change in Leadership Style.

White, Steven J. (1989). A Leadership Study of a High School Principal.

Summer 1990

Brownlee, Jeannie L. (1990). A Case Study of the Leadership Style of Jan Hart: An Elementary School Principal.

Davis, Kevin S. (1990). A Principal in a Small "B-Size" School District: A Field Study of Leadership and Organizational Styles.

Fox, Beverly. (1990). A Leadership Case Study of a High School Principal.

Harder, Carl. (1990). Every Knight Has a Day: A Study in Leadership Style.

Holladay, Marilyn J. (1990). Middle School Principal in an International Setting: A Case Study.

Hughes, Allen T. (1990). Leadership Projection: A Study of the Rural Superintendency.

Jones, Eleanor J. (1990). Projection and Action in an International School: A Leadership Study.

Klock, Kathy. (1990). One Elementary School Principal: A Leadership Study.

McMullen Justine C. (1990). A Secondary Vice Principal as a Change Agent for Cultural Socialization.

Michaelis, Randall B. (1990). A Single Case Study of an Experienced Principal's Leadership Style in a New Building.

Orr, James. L. (1990). The Business Manager: A Leadership Study.

Pratt, Diana R. (1990). A Study of the Leadership Style of William Tell in Wheatfield University.

Randolph, William. (1990). The Leadership Style of Tracy Dickson at Rose Bud Elementary School: A Preliminary Examination.

Ziebell, Wesley W. (1990). Leadership and Role of the Principal: A Single Subject Leadership Study.

Appendix B

The Self-Response Questionnaire

LEADERSHIP AND ROLE STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

I have been asked to prepare a paper on the effectiveness of using leadership and role study assignments in educational administration courses. In assessing the effectiveness of these assignments, it is important that I get input from the graduate students who completed the assignments. Would you please fill out this questionnaire as soon as possible and return it to me immediately in the enclosed envelope. If an item does not apply to you, please write **N/A** by the item number. All responses will be held strictly confidential.

Note that the addresses on the envelopes are different from Washington State University because I am on a sabbatical leave this academic year working at the California Educational Research Cooperative (CERC) in the School of Education, University of California, Riverside.

Please mail your completed questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope to Donald B. Reed, CERC Office, School of Education, University of California, P.O. Box 112, Riverside, CA 92502-9966. If you should have any questions, please call me at my office, (714) 787-3026, or at my home, (714) 683-4749. Thanks for your help and assistance.

Donald B. Reed
Associate Professor
Washington State University

Statements 1-3 refer to your program in the Department of Educational Administration & Supervision at Washington State University **at the time you took the ED AD 580 course**, Spring 1989, Summer 1989, Fall 1989, or Summer 1990.

Please respond to the following statements by circling the appropriate number where:

5 = Strongly agree	4 = Agree	3 = Equally agree and disagree	2 = Disagree	1 = Strongly disagree

1. The program in Educational Administration is a useful experience. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
2. The sequence of courses in my degree /credential program is appropriate. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
3. I took the ED AD 580 course at about the right time in my program. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

Turn over the page and continue.

Statements 5-12 refer to the School Organization and Administration course' (ED AD 580) **at the time you took the course**.

Please respond to the following statements by circling the appropriate number where:

5 = Strongly agree	4 = Agree	3 = Equally agree and disagree	2 = Disagree	1 = Strongly disagree

5. The content of the course was appropriate. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

6. I gained insights from the course. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

7. I learned from the other students in the course. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

8. The assignments in the course were useful. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

9. The amount of work in the course was about right. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

10. The leadership/role study was a useful assignment. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

11. The leadership/role study required an appropriate amount of time. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

12. In comparison to other assignments in the ED AD 580 course, I found the study the most useful. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

Statements 13-30 refer to you **at the time you took the ED AD 580 course**.

Please fill in the blank or respond as indicated. Where years are requested, round off to the nearest full year.

13. I was enrolled in the ED AD 580 course during: **(Circle one.)**

Spring 1989 -- Summer 1989 -- Fall 1989 -- Summer 1990

14. The study I conducted was a: **(Circle one.)**

Leadership Study -- Role Study

15. I presented my study in class. **(Circle one.)** **Yes -- No**

Continue on the next page.

16. I presented my study in a setting other than class. **(Circle one.)** **Yes -- No**

17. The number of years of professional experience I had in public education was: _____

18. The number of years in my current position was: _____

19. The highest academic degree I held was a: **(Circle one.)**

Bachelors Degree -- Masters Degree -- Doctoral Degree

20. The name of the highest level of Washington education certification I held was: _____

21. My gender is: **(Circle one.)** **Male -- Female**

22. The title of my current position was: _____

23. The level of my current position was: **(Circle one.)**

Elementary School -- Middle/Junior High School -- High School

Central Office -- Other: _____ (Specify.)

24. The student enrollment in my school was: _____

25. The student enrollment in my district was: _____

26. I was working toward completing the requirements for a Washington education certificate. **(Circle one.)** **Yes -- No**

27. I was working toward completing the requirements for an advanced degree at Washington State University. **(Circle one.)** **Yes -- No**

28. The Washington certificate I was working toward was: _____

29. The advanced degree I was working toward was: _____

30. The next professional position I wanted to hold was: _____

Turn over the page and continue.

Statements 31-47 refer to the leadership/role study you conducted in the ED AD 580 course.

Please respond to the following statements by circling the appropriate number where:

5 = Strongly agree	4 = Agree	3 = Equally agree and disagree	2 = Disagree	1 = Strongly disagree

31. I gained a theoretical understanding of the role which I studied. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

32. I gained a theoretical appreciation of the concept of leadership. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

33. I learned how a community relates to a school in a very specific way. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

34. I learned how a school relates to a district in a very specific way. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

35. I learned how a role relates to a school in a very specific way 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

36. I learned about very concrete aspects of a position. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

37. I learned practical job skills. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

38. I obtained a theoretical understanding of qualitative research. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

39. I gained a better appreciation for educational research. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

40. I learned how to design, conduct, and report a qualitative study. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

41. I developed my interviewing skills. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

42. I developed my observational skills. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

43. I developed my data recording skills. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

44. I developed skills to analyze data. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

45. I improved my writing skills. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

46. I am satisfied with the benefits I gained from conducting the leadership/role study. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

47. I am satisfied with my report of my study. 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

Continue on the next page.

With very few words, please respond to questions 48-51.

48. What recommendations do you have for improving the leadership/role study assignment?

49. What were the most important benefits of the leadership/role study?

50. In this questionnaire, what was not asked that should have been asked? For any, indicate the question and give your response.

51. If you have any other comments regarding any aspect of the leadership/role study or this questionnaire, please make them here.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Now, please return it to Donald B. Reed, CERC Office, School of Education, University of California, P.O. Box 112, Riverside, CA 92502-9966.

Appendix C

Leadership and Role Study Questionnaire Item Matrix*

CONTEXT OF THE CASE STUDY RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

	Contextual Factors		
Experiential Time When the Study Was Conducted	**Programmatic**	**Course**	**Individual**
Past	(Not assessed.)	(Not assessed.)	17, 18, 19 & 20
Present	1, 2 & 3	5, 6, 7, 8 9, 10, 11 & 12	13, 14, 15 16, 21, 22 23, 24 & 25
Future	(Not assessed.)	(Not assessed.)	26, 27, 28 29 & 30

IMPACT OF THE CASE STUDY RESEARCH EXPERIENCE (46 & 47)

	Level of Knowledge Gained		
Type of Knowledge Gained	**Theoretical**	**Substantive**	**Practical**
Role Investigated	31 & 32	33, 34 35, & 36	37
Research Processes	38 & 39	40	41, 42, 43 44 & 45

* The numbers within the matrix cells refer to the items in the Questionnaire contained in Appendix B. The Questionnaire does not contain an item numbered 4.